

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure, stating that it “appears to be written as if it were a Claim and is not in narrative form”. The Abstract has been amended as shown above.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, stating that the term “the computer” lacks antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been amended as shown above, to cure the defect.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 stating that claim 1 “is so broad that it is directed to the abstract idea itself, rather than a practical implementation of the concept” and that claim 15 “is a program per se and does not fall within at least one of the four enumerated categories of patentable subject matter recited in section 101 (process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter)”. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to cure the defects.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fuller III *et al.* (hereafter "Fuller") (US 7,134,081). Applicant submits that the claims as currently amended are not anticipated by Fuller.

Claim 1 requires that when metadata is associated with the API call, obtaining the associated metadata; and automatically determining a best estimation of the client program grammar communication from the associated metadata and from the API call; and otherwise automatically obtaining a best estimation of the client program grammar communication from the API call.

The Examiner cites several passages in Fuller (col. 4, lines 49-65; col. 7, line 47 – col. 9, line 67; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 62; col. 20, lines 17-36; and col. 24, lines 53-60) as teaching all the limitations of the claim.

The Examiner has not provided any details of the Examiner’s interpretation of the cited passages, but as best Applicant can determine, the Examiner is looking to portions such as column 4, lines 55-63 and column 14, lines 6-14 as teaching the automatic determination

and obtaining a best estimation of the client program grammar communication. Applicant submits that these passages in Fuller teach that “syntax completion and suggestions” and “syntax information” are provided to the user, who then may choose to accept the suggestion or act on the information as desired. However, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching regarding the provision of a **best estimation** of the client program grammar communication, as the claim requires.

Hence, Applicant submits that Fuller does not anticipate claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further requires that the API call is a .NET API call, The Examiner points to col. 24, lines 53-60 of Fuller as providing this teaching. The cited passage concerns two National Instruments software packages that include tools for monitoring API calls. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching that any API call monitored is a .NET API call. Hence, there are additional grounds for allowing claim 2.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 through claim 3, and further requires evaluating the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication for conformance of the best estimation of the SCPI communication to SCPI specifications. The Examiner points to several passages (col. 4, lines 49-65; col. 7, line 47 – col. 9, lines 67; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 62; and col. 20, lines 17-36) as providing this teaching. Applicant submits that at most, the cited passages teach that the syntax completion and suggestions provided to the user may be prepared in accordance with the SCPI standard. The Examiner has not pointed to any teaching regarding the **evaluation** of any communication for **conformance** to SCPI specifications, as the claim requires. Hence, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing claim 4 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and further requires, when the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication does not conform to the SCPI specifications, manually adjusting the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication to conform to SCPI specifications. The Examiner points to several passages (col. 4, lines 49-65; col. 7, line 47 – col. 9, lines 67; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 62; and col. 20, lines 17-36) as providing this teaching.

Applicant finds no teaching in the cited passages concerning the **manual adjustment** of any SCPI communication to conform to SCPI specifications. Hence, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing claim 5.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 through claim 3, and further requires evaluating the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication for conformance of the best estimation of the SCPI communication to General-Purpose Interface Bus specifications. The Examiner points to several passages (col. 4, lines 49-65; col. 7, line 47 – col. 9, lines 67; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 62; and col. 20, lines 17-36) as providing this teaching. Applicant finds no teaching in the cited passages concerning the **evaluation** of any communication for **conformance** to GPIB specifications. Hence, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing claim 6 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and further requires, when the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication does not conform to GPIB specifications, manually adjusting the obtained best estimation of the SCPI communication to conform to GPIB specifications. The Examiner points to several passages (col. 4, lines 49-65; col. 7, line 47 – col. 9, lines 67; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 62; and col. 20, lines 17-36) as providing this teaching. Applicant finds no teaching in the cited passages concerning the **manual adjustment** of any SCPI communication to conform to SCPI specifications. Hence, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing claim 7.

As to Claim 8-14, the Examiner states that claims 8-14 “are the same as claims 1-7, except claims 8-14 are computer readable memory device claims and claims 1-7 are method claims”. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Fuller does not teach the provision of a **best estimation** of the client program grammar communication. Hence, Applicant submits that Fuller does not anticipate claim 8 and the claims dependent therefrom. Moreover, just as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing dependent claims 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

As to claims 15-19, the Examiner states that claims 15-19 “are the same as claims 1-4 and 6, except claims 15-19 are system claims and claims 1-4 and 6 are method claims”. As

discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Fuller does not teach the provision of a **best estimation** of the client program grammar communication. Hence, Applicant submits that Fuller does not anticipate claim 8 and the claims dependent therefrom. Moreover, as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 4, and 6, Applicant submits that there are additional grounds for allowing dependent claims 16, 18, and 19.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Calvin B. Ward".

Calvin B. Ward
Registration No. 30,896
Date: December 3, 2007

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Legal Department, M/S DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599
Telephone (925) 855-0413
Telefax (925) 855-9214